Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN D. HUNTER,

Plaintiff,

v.

S. ODOM,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Defendant.

Case No. 19-cv-00847-JST

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE DISMISSAL

Now pending before the Court is Defendant's motion to dismiss. ECF No. 34. On October 19, 2020, the Court granted Plaintiff an extension of time to December 3, 2020, to file his opposition. ECF No. 36. On October 30, 2020, this order was returned to the Court as undeliverable because Plaintiff is no longer in custody. ECF No. 37. Since that time, the Court has received no communication from Plaintiff regarding his address or any other aspect of this case.

Civil Local Rule 3-11 provides as follows:

- (a) Duty to Notify. An attorney or a party proceeding pro se whose address changes while an action is pending must promptly file with the Court and serve upon all opposing parties a Notice of Change of Address specifying the new address.
- (b) Dismissal Due to Failure. The Court may, without prejudice, dismiss a complaint or strike an answer when:
 - (1) Mail directed to the attorney or pro se party by the Court has been returned to the Court as not deliverable; and
 - (2) The Court fails to receive within 60 days of this return a written communication from the attorney or pro se party indicating a current address.

Civ. L.R. 3-11.

United States District Court Northern District of California

In light of the foregoing, Plaintiff John Hunter is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE why this case should not be dismissed without prejudice. A written response is due June 4, 2021. If no response is received, the Court will dismiss the complaint.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 10, 2021

JON S. TIGAR United States District Judge